

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on September 27, 2007.

Claims 1 and 14 are amended, no claims are canceled or added; as a result, claims 1-26 remain pending in this application.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Examiner **Robert Mosser** for the courtesy of a personal interview on **February 21, 2008** with Applicant's representative **Rodney Lacy**.

Applicant's representative presented new proposed amendments and discussed how the claimed invention distinguishes over Gatto et al. (U.S. 6,908,391). No agreement regarding the status of the claims was reached during the interview.

### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Gatto et al. (U.S. 6,908,391). Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, “[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim*.” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-26 as amended are not anticipated because the claims contain elements not found in Gatto.

For example, claim 1 as amended recites “sending service information for the accounting service from the accounting service to a discovery agent on the gaming network.” Claim 14 recites similar elements regarding an accounting service sending service information to a discovery agent. Applicant has reviewed Gatto and can find no disclosure of a service sending service information about an accounting service to a discovery agent on a gaming network.

Further, claim 1 recites “determining by the discovery agent if the accounting service is authentic and authorized.” Claim 14 recites similar language with respect to a discovery agent authenticating and authorizing an accounting service. Applicant has reviewed Gatto and can find no teaching or suggestion of authenticating and authorizing a service such as an accounting service. Further, there is no disclosure in Gatto of a discovery agent that authenticates and authorizes an accounting service for a gaming network.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 14 recite elements that are not disclosed in Gatto. Therefore claims 1, 14 are not anticipated by Gatto. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 14.

Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and claims 14-26 depend from claim 14. These dependent claims inherit the elements of their respective base claims 1 and 14 and are not anticipated by Gatto for at least the reasons discussed above regarding their respective base claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-13 and 15-26.

#### Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner’s personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of

the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

### CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at (612) 373-6954 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6954


Date February 27, 2008

By   
Rodney L. Lacy  
Reg. No. 41,136

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 27 day of February 2008.

Zhakalazky M. Carrion

Name

  
Signature